| Case 3:07-cv-00556-JM-BLM Document 8 Filed 11/01/07 PageID.113 Page 1 of 1 | | | | | |
|--|---|----------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | |
| 8 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | | | | |
| 9 | SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | | | | |
| 10 | GARY ABELAR | | CA | SE NO. 07cv05 | 56 JM(BLM) |
| 11 | vs. | Petition | | DER ADOPTIN | NG REPORT AND TION RE: |
| 12 | | | DE | ANTING IN PA NYING IN PAI | RT |
| 13 | KEN CLARK, Warden, | | DIS | SPONDENT'S SMISS | MOTION TO |
| 14 | Respondent. On September 11, 2007 Magistrate Judge Barbara L. Major entered a Report and | | | | |
| 15 | Recommendation recommending the denial of the motion to dismiss the Petition on the ground that | | | | |
| 16 | claim two is unexhausted and the granting of the motion to dismiss on the ground that the Petition is | | | | |
| 17 18 | untimely ("R & R"). The R & R, expressly incorporated herein, thoroughly and thoughtfully analyzed | | | | |
| 19 | Petitioner's claims and recommended that the petition be dismissed as time-barred. Petitioner has | | | | |
| 20 | filed objections to the R & R ("Objections"). Respondent did not file a reply to the Objections. | | | | |
| 21 | Pursuant to Local Rule 7.1(d)(1), this matter is appropriate for decision without oral argument. | | | | |
| 22 | In his Objections, Petitioner sets forth essentially the same arguments raised in the Petition and | | | | |
| 23 | addressed in the R & R. Instead of responding to these arguments a second time, the court adopts the | | | | |
| 24 | R & R in its entirety. The Petition is dismissed as time-barred. | | | | |
| 25 | IT IS SO ORDERED. | | | | |
| 26 | DATED: November 1, 2007 | 7 | $\bigcirc \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{U}}$ | >v. | |
| 27 | | | Hop. Jeffrey | eg Thi | ele |
| 28 | cc: All parties | | | s District Judge | |
| | F ##### | | | | |

- 1 - 07cv0556